

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 6, 2008. Claims 1-10 remain pending in the application prior to this amendment and claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 stand rejected. Claims 3-5, 9, and 10 are objected to, and claim 8 has been withdrawn in view of a Restriction Requirement. Claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended herein, and new claim 11 has been added. The status indicator of claim 8 has been updated. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 8 was objected to with respect to the status identifier. The status identifier of claim 8 has been updated herein to indicate that the claim is withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by EP 0 936 000 to Martin. Claim 1 is the only independent claim of this rejected group and is directed to a method of attaching a nozzle to a dispensing valve. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "pivoting the nozzle clamping and ejecting lever to a second position causing the clamping and ejecting lever to contact the nozzle and move the nozzle away from the nozzle mounting surface." Amended claim 1 emphasizes that the method involves active movement of the nozzle relative to the nozzle mounting surface

by contact with the clamping and ejecting lever.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 because Martin '000 fails to disclose " causing the clamping and ejecting lever to contact the nozzle and move the nozzle away from the nozzle mounting surface," as recited in amended claim 1. Specifically, Martin '000 discloses an adhesive dispensing module with a quick disconnect assembly that permits a die tip or nozzle to be replaced without removing the module from the manifold. In a clamping position, a retainer plate 80 cooperates with a surface 54 on the module 12 to engage beveled surfaces 81, 82 on a die tip 18 to forcefully secure die tip 18 to the module 12. (See, e.g., Martin '000 at paragraphs 0006, and 0040-47, and FIGS. 3-4.) However, Martin '000 fails to disclose any structure whatsoever that moves the die tip 18 (or nozzle) away from mounting surfaces 46, 47 when plate 80 is moved to a second position. Rather, the retainer plate 80 of Martin '000 is merely moved aside to "permit the die tip 18 to be removed from the die body 16A." (Martin '000 at paragraph 0047.) For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 each depend from independent claim 1 and are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above for claim 1. Claim 6 has been amended herein to recite "moving the fastener to clamp the clamping and ejecting lever in the first position," and "moving the fastener to permit the clamping and ejecting lever to pivot to the second position." Support for this amendment to claim 6 can be found with reference to the Application at p. 13, lines 1-7, and p. 14, line 21 - p. 15, line 18. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by this amendment to claim 6. Claim 7

Application No. 10/713,451
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2008
Amendment dated December 30, 2008

has been amended to be consistent with the language of claim 6. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2, 6, and 7 also be withdrawn.

New Claim

New claim 11 has been added by this amendment. Claim 11 depends from claim 9 (which in turn depends from claim 1) and recites language similar to amended claim 6. Support for new claim 9 can be found with reference to the Application at p. 13, lines 1-7, and p. 14, line 21 through p. 15, line 18. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by new claim 11.

Claim 11 is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Early and favorable indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-5, 9, and 10 were objected to for depending from rejected base claims, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject matter of these claims, but believe that rewriting the claims in independent form is unnecessary in view of the remarks above.

Application No. 10/713,451
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2008
Amendment dated December 30, 2008

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims and the remarks set forth herein, Applicants believe this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicants do not believe that any fee is due in connection with this communication. However, if any fees are necessary to complete this communication, the Commissioner may consider this to be a request for such and charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /David W. Dorton/
David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)